REMARKS

Obvious errors of claim dependency have been corrected by amendments to dependent claims 5 and 6.

The examiner has rejected the two independent claims (1, 4) under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregg (US 5948060) ("Gregg") in view of a publication entitled "International Organization for Standardization", published in 1999 ("IOS publication"). The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection, as neither Gregg nor the IOS publication, alone or in combination, come even close to suggesting the invention of claims 1 and 4.

Claims 1 and 4 have to do with the mechanism used by a receiving station to send a response to a transmitting station to indicate receipt of a frame from the transmitting station. A conventional way of sending such a response is to include the full address of the transmitting station (as well as other information). Instead the invention has the receiving station transmit a response (the "second frame transmission") that includes "information from the first frame transmission that is likely unique to the first frame transmission". The summary section of the application summarized the advantages of the invention as follows:

> Among the advantages of the present invention are the following. The "quasi-addressing" mechanism of the invention allows a source station that is expecting a response to determine if a received response is responsive to a frame originated by that source station, that is, it serves to bind the response to the frame, but at a significantly lower overhead cost. Thus, the bit savings associated with the overhead reduction can be applied to other response information requirements.

(Application, p. 2) Thus, any string of bits that is likely unique to the transmitted frame may be used for the response. One possibility is to use a portion of a frame check sequence, e.g., the least significant bits of a cyclical redundancy code (CRC) of the transmitted frame. But other information likely unique to the transmitted frame could be used instead. The detailed description includes a discussion of one implementation of the invention in which the 10 least significant bits of the CRC are used in the response:

> For a DT value corresponding to a response (see Table 1 below), however, the VF field 134 is defined to include the Channel Access Priority (CAP) 144 copied from the Variant field in the end delimiter of the frame for which the response is created, a 1-bit ACK field 145 and a 10-bit Response Frame Field (RFF) 146. The RFF 146 is defined as a Received Frame Check Sequence (RFCS) 148 when the value of ACK=0b01 (ACK). The RFCS 148 includes a portion corresponding to the least significant 10 bits of the 16-bit CRC (FCS field) received in the frame for which the response is being sent. The transmitting station that sent the frame requesting the response compares the RFCS against the corresponding transmitted CRC bits in the FCS to determine the validity of the response. If the transmitting station detects a match, the response is accepted. If the RFCS does not match the relevant portion of the FCS, the response is ignored and treated as if no response was received. Other information from the frame (that requested the response) that is similarly unique or likely to be unique to the frame could be used instead.

(Application, pp. 15-16)

Neither of the examiner's references teach anything remotely relevant to the invention. Gregg teaches a mechanism for speeding up the transfer of data between computer systems, but the mechanism responsible for improving the speed of transfer has nothing to do with the type of information that is returned in a response to a transmitting computer. Instead, the improvements come from such things as improving the utilization of processors (see col. 6 for a summary of the Gregg invention). And by the examiner's own admission the ISO publication teaches merely that destination addresses are used in transmitting frames between stations.

The examiner points to col. 1, lines 8-17 and col. 4, lines 45-67 of Gregg as support for the rejection, but neither portion of Gregg is at all relevant to the invention. All that is taught at col. 1, lines 8-17 is that the objective of the Gregg invention is to speed up data transfers (col. 1, lines 8-17); nothing is taught there about how to speed up the transfers. All that is taught at col. 4, lines 45-67 is the conventional prior art approach of having a receiving station or computer send an "acknowledge" to the transmitting station using the transmitting station's address (the discussion at col. 4, lines 45-67 is a summary of the prior art). Reading further along in Gregg makes it clear that Gregg does not intend to depart from this convention of using an "acknowledge".

Accordingly, the independent claims are in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on one or more of the independent claims, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Enclosed is a $950.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/1/04

G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20836474.doc